



Moreover, in his Memorandum in Opposition, Hutchins refers to a motion for sanctions that he filed in the state court action that Compliant filed against Hutchins in Ohio. Hutchins filed the motion on August 8, 2006. It was meritless and based on unsupported, fabricated claims raised by Hutchins in an effort to defame Compliant and its attorneys and create an appearance of impropriety where none exists.<sup>1</sup> Inexplicably, the court initially granted the motion for sanctions on August 15, before the expiration of Compliant's time to respond.

However, the Ohio court has vacated its sanctions order. On August 18, the day its attorneys received notice of the court's order, Compliant sensed that Hutchins' motion was granted in error and immediately filed a Motion for Reconsideration. The court quickly granted Compliant's Motion for Reconsideration and vacated its order for sanctions on August 23. See Judgment Entry, attached hereto at Exhibit A. It is unclear whether the court's initial order granting the motion for sanctions was the result of a clerical error, an internal miscommunication, or something else, but the court has swiftly and decisively overturned that erroneous decision.<sup>2</sup> Hence, there is no order of sanctions against Compliant or its attorneys in any court, and the "malicious acts" to which Hutchins refers never occurred.

---

<sup>1</sup> Essentially, in his motion, Hutchins alleged that Compliant's attorneys had held improper ex parte communications with the Ohio court's staff. In fact, no such communications ever took place and were completely imagined by Hutchins.

<sup>2</sup> In fact, the Ohio court's Judgment Entry granting the motion for sanctions provided no reasoning but, instead, simply and matter of factly stated that the motion was granted. It provided no explanation. Thus, Hutchins' claims that the court had "recognized [Compliant's] injudicious acts," etc., were pure speculation, and, in any event, are now irrelevant given that the court has corrected its ruling.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, as well as those set forth in Compliant's original Motion to Strike, Hutchins' Amended Complaint should be stricken.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Jeffrey J. Lauderdale

WILLIAM E. COUGHLIN (0010874)  
COLLEEN MORAN O'NEIL (0066576)  
JEFFREY J. LAUDERDALE (0074859)  
CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP  
1400 McDonald Investment Center  
800 Superior Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 622-8200  
(216) 241-0816 (facsimile)

JOHN J. EGAN (151680)  
EGAN, FLANAGAN & COHEN, P.C.  
PO Box 9035  
67 Market Street  
Springfield, MA 01102-9035  
(216) 622-8200  
FAX (216) 241-0816

Attorneys for Defendant,  
Compliant Corporation

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that, on September 18, 2006, I electronically filed a copy of the foregoing Defendant Compliant Corporation's Reply in Support of Motion to Strike Amended Complaint (Leave to File Granted September 15, 2006) and that parties to the case, registered with the Court's electronic filing system, will receive electronic notice of such filing. A copy of the foregoing was also served upon the following via first-class U.S. mail on today's date:

Donald C. Hutchins  
1047 Longmeadow Street  
Longmeadow, Massachusetts 01106  
Pro Se

s/ Jeffrey J. Lauderdale  
One of the Attorneys for Defendant,  
Compliant Corporation